

APPROVED FOR
02/04/03

22
content items based on their interests. Figure 2 illustrates a prior art system which comprises monitor 200, computer CPU unit 202, mouse 204, and keyboard 206. Users view on the computer monitor 200 various heterogeneous content items (like A, B, and C) and, based on their interest, they interact with one or more or a combination of heterogeneous content items via mouse 204 or keyboard 206. This step is very "user driven" since the system does not have a means for dynamically tracking user interests (whether they are interested in A, B, or C) regarding the displayed heterogeneous content and hence the computer waits for the user to respond via an input device before proceeding with any action.

Please amend page 4, lines 13 to page 5, line 7 as follows:

33
Figure 3 illustrates some of the common eye movements observed during reading. Common eye movement behaviors observed in reading 300 include forward saccades (or jumps) 302 of various length (eye-movements to the right), micro-saccades (small movements in various directions) 304, fixations of various duration 306, regressions (eye-movements to the left) 308, jitters (shaky movements) 310, and nystagmus (a rapid, involuntary, oscillatory motion of the eyeball) 312. As illustrated by Figure 4, these behaviors in turn depend on several factors 400, some of which include (but are not restricted to): text difficulty 402, word length 404, word frequency 406, font size 408, font color 410, distortion 412, user distance to display 414, and individual differences 416. Individual differences that affect eye-movements further include, but are not limited to, reading speed 418, intelligence 420, age 422, and language skills 424. For example, as the text becomes more difficult to comprehend, fixation duration increases (as described by Just & Carpenter in their paper entitled, *A theory of reading: From eye fixations to comprehension*, Psychological Review, 1980) and the number of regressions increases (as described by Rayner & Frazier in their paper entitled, *Parsing temporarily ambiguous complements*, Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1987.) Given the complexity of eye-gaze patterns and the detailed information about the text and the individual required to predict these patterns, there have been no attempts to build a system to recognize reading until now.

Best Available Copy

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action dated 11/7/2002. This amendment should obviate outstanding issues and make the remaining claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the remarks that follow.